

International Journal of Human Rights Education

Volume 1 | Issue 1

Article 2

2017

Revisiting 'Emerging Models of Human Rights Education'

Felisa L. Tibbitts

Teachers College, Columbia University & Utrecht University, ft2442@tc.columbia.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://repository.usfca.edu/ijhre>

Recommended Citation

Tibbitts, Felisa L.. (2017) . "Revisiting 'Emerging Models of Human Rights Education,'" *International Journal of Human Rights Education*, 1(1) .

Retrieved from <http://repository.usfca.edu/ijhre/vol1/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. It has been accepted for inclusion in International Journal of Human Rights Education by an authorized editor of USF Scholarship: a digital repository @ Gleeson Library | Geschke Center. For more information, please contact repository@usfca.edu.

Revisiting ‘Emerging Models of Human Rights Education’

Felisa L. Tibbitts^{*}

Teachers College, Columbia University & Utrecht University

Abstract

In 2002, the author published three models for categorizing human rights education practice in the formal and non-formal education sectors: Values and Awareness, Accountability and Transformation, which are widely cited in the HRE literature. The original models were developed by applying grounded theory from a practitioner’s point of view about learner goals, target groups and other practical elements of educational programming, such as content and methodologies. The emerging models of HRE practice were linked with praxis and strategies for social change. In this article, the author suggests updates to these models based on the ensuing 14 years of scholarship, documentation and observation of practice across a range of teaching and learning settings globally. The proposed amendments to the models include a stronger association of the Values and Awareness Model with socialization, the Accountability Model with professional development, and the Transformation Model with activism.

^{*} Felisa Tibbitts is a Lecturer in the Comparative and International Education Program at Teachers College, Columbia University and Chair of Human Rights Education at Utrecht University. Her research interests are in human rights, (global) democratic citizenship and peace education; education in post-conflict and transitional societies; curriculum development and reform; critical pedagogy; and social change theory.
Email: ft2442@tc.columbia.edu

Introduction¹

Human rights education (HRE) as a newly established field of educational theory and practice is gaining increased attention and significance across the globe. This effort, which gained momentum along with the ascent of the human rights movement in the early 1990s, has generated a growing body of educational theory, practice and research.

HRE is a practice-oriented expression of the high-minded ideals of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), including equality and respect for human dignity. Within the schooling sector, HRE goals, content and methodologies intersect with citizenship education, peace education, anti-racism education, Holocaust/genocide education, education for sustainable development and education for intercultural understanding. However, HRE is not only aimed at the formal education sector but has deep roots in popular education and the non-formal education sector. HRE also takes place in the training of professionals, such as journalists, teachers and law enforcement officials.

On the one hand, HRE can be viewed as a steward of globalization through the transmission of so-called universal values, legal norms and the promotion of transnational human rights activism. On the other hand, HRE can be seen as a learning process that induces the recognition of personal values and promotes local agency for personal and social change. This paradox has become central to the evolution of HRE theory and practice.

In 2002, I published three models for categorizing human rights education practice in the formal and non-formal education sectors: Values and Awareness, Accountability and Transformation (Tibbitts, 2002).² Infused within these models of HRE was an understanding of educational programming, learning theory and social change. The original models were

¹ This article is based on a chapter in *Human Rights Education: Theory, Research, Praxis* (2017, University of Pennsylvania Press) edited by Monisha Bajaj.

² This article has been widely cited in the HRE literature and has been the basis for subsequent HRE models and critiques, some of which are identified in this article. I am using the term “transformation” rather than “transformational” in this article, a slight change from the original Models article, based solely on linguistic considerations.

organized applying grounded theory from a practitioner's point of view about learner goals, target groups and other practical elements of educational programming, such as content and methodologies. The emerging models of HRE practice were linked with praxis and strategies for social change.

In this article, I suggest revisions to these models, based on the ensuing 15 years of scholarship, documentation and observation of practice across a range of teaching and learning settings globally, including my own.³ This writing has been a reflexive praxis that has allowed me to distill my own understanding of how the field of human rights education has evolved. This process is consistent with grounded theory, which calls for researchers to continuously refine their definition of concepts and to check their models.

In the first half of the article, I present the goals of HRE as preventing human rights violations, and human rights activism as a subset of activities within a broader social change effort. I then consider the theories of change for the HRE models and learner outcomes in relation to both human rights activism and social change, recognizing the value of learners taking action in both the private and public domains in relation to social change. I identify new dimensions of the HRE models that add descriptive complexity and strengthen their analytical power. One new addition is teaching and learning practices, for which I present and critically review a range of methodologies used in HRE: didactic, participatory, empowerment and transformational.

In the second part of the article, I revisit the original HRE models, critically applying these new dimensions. I argue that the original HRE

³ Since 2002, I continued to engage in HRE as an instructor of hundreds of teachers and adult learners in the human rights, humanitarian and development sectors through my position at Human Rights Education Associates (HREA) and a faculty member at various universities. I have developed HRE-related curriculum guides for the formal and nonformal sectors and carried out impact assessments for national and cross-national programs. I have also engaged with inter-governmental human rights groups in developing policies, strategies and technical resources for implementing HRE-related norms and practices. These experiences have continuously provided me with opportunities to dialogue with colleagues from all parts of the world about HRE concepts and practices, including ongoing challenges and opportunities.

models remain useful typologies for describing HRE practices and for critically analyzing their design in promoting agency in learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. However, I propose amendments to the models including a stronger association of the Values and Awareness Model with socialization, the Accountability Model with professional development, and the Transformation Model with activism. In this article I will explore in greater depth the proposed changes to the Transformation Model in light of its increasing recognition of its centrality to emancipatory HRE.

I. Key Concepts

Goals of Human Rights Education

The most widely accepted definition of human rights education (HRE) is that offered by the United Nations, whose General Assembly passed in December 2011 a Declaration on Human Rights Education and Training with the following language (Article 2)⁴:

1. Human rights education and training comprises all educational, training, information, awareness-raising and learning activities aimed at promoting universal respect for and observance of all human rights and fundamental freedoms and thus contributing, inter alia, to the prevention of human rights violations and abuses by providing persons with knowledge, skills and understanding and developing their attitudes and behaviors, to empower them to contribute to the building and promotion of a universal culture of human rights
2. Human rights education and training encompasses:
 - (a) Education about human rights, which includes providing knowledge and understanding of human rights norms and princi-

⁴ I am using the UN policies as a key validator of HRE definitions, particularly as these have been influenced by practitioners, including NGOs such as Amnesty International, over the past decades. Thus, although the language of the documents remains general they nevertheless offer normative guidance that is based in part on input from the grassroots level.

ples, the values that underpin them and the mechanisms for their protection;

(b) Education through human rights, which includes learning and teaching in a way that respects the rights of both educators and learners;

(c) Education for human rights, which includes empowering persons to enjoy and exercise their rights and to respect and uphold the rights of others. (United Nations General Assembly, 2011)

The first paragraph reaffirms the UN's long-standing definition that HRE has a place in all forms of education and training, including the formal, nonformal and informal sectors. These were represented across the original HRE Models.

The second paragraph reflects the evolution of HRE practice, sharing more details than the original UN definition, as HRE *about, through* and *for* human rights affirms the full spectrum of learner goals in accordance with knowledge/understanding, values, capacities and actions, with a framework of personal empowerment. This new, extended definition also draws attention to teaching and learning processes and reaffirms the outcomes of HRE as being oriented towards taking action “for” human rights.

The goal to prevent human rights violations is central to HRE. Human rights norms are codified in international law in an ongoing manner and are intended to be protected in national law, policies and practices. Human rights violations can result from direct action or inaction of governments or individuals. Combating human rights violations and the conditions of inequality and injustice that foster them requires a critical reflection and recognition of the symptoms and sources, and taking action so such violations no longer occur. The human rights (legal) standards are oriented towards the changed behavior of governments, as they are the entities that sign human rights treaties and voluntarily commit themselves to uphold them. Human rights activism therefore is oriented towards changing the behavior of governments, although the obligations of certain non-state actors such as multinational corporations and armed groups are increasingly addressed in human rights policy and scholarship.

Governments are not only law makers and foreign policy advisors but also flesh-and-blood people who are employees of the state, including the military, law enforcement officials, civil servants, social workers, health workers and teachers. Human rights activism therefore, by definition, is first oriented towards the changed behavior of governments and their representatives at all levels – national, sub-national and local – in relation to their behavior and the elimination of human rights violations. The original HRE Accountability Model was oriented towards the infusion of HRE within the training of government personnel so as to help ensure that they respect human rights in carrying out their responsibilities.

However, human rights activism takes place within a wider social change framework, one that involves the changed behavior of non-state actors, that is, everyday people in their daily lives, regardless of whether or not they work for the government. The norms for such changed behavior can be fed through the human rights framework. The cross-cutting (human rights) values of non-discrimination, equality, inclusion and participation, as well as the norms associated with the human rights of specific groups, such as members of marginalized groups, women, children, migrants and persons with disabilities, are eligible to contribute to social change processes more generally, inspiring behavioral changes in anyone. The original HRE Transformation Model highlighted the empowerment of disadvantaged groups for organizing collectively, not only to carry out human rights activism but to carry forward social change more generally.

Social change and human rights activism are related but they are not synonymous. Human rights activism can be defined as collective action undertaken to influence the behavior of governments so that laws, policies and practices are consistent with human rights standards. An example of this would be mobilization for the release of prisoners of conscience or prisoners at Guantanamo⁵, who have not been provided with the opportunity of a trial. This is the approach of traditional human rights groups.

⁵ Since the US military prison at Guantanamo Bay opened in 2002, over 775 prisoners have been detained. 45 men were still held as of January 2017, and five of these men have been recommended for release by high-level governmental review processes (Myre, 2017).

Social change is a long-term process involving changes in beliefs and behaviors of both state and non-state actors. Human rights activism around changing government laws might be involved, but it would not represent the complete agenda. An example of this might be a lobbying effort to revise the Criminal Code to better protect victims of domestic violence, which might be part of a wider social movement to promote the equality of women.

The human rights movement as a whole has been perhaps overly defined by its association with legal standards and social action goals to influence political and legal environments. The women's movement has always recognized that gender equality would be brought about by a social movement that encompasses such legal and policy reforms but also through the empowerment of individual women. The aims of women's human rights organizations towards influencing both national protection systems as well as grassroots social change has required any human rights education programming that is organized to potentially contribute towards both.

Thus, consistent with the higher aim of HRE to reduce human rights violations, HRE can be oriented towards changes in the public domain (the behavior of governments) but also changes in the private domain (the behavior of individuals). The former calls for activism and collective action whereas the latter can occur through individual (non-legal) actions taken in the privacy of one's home, school or community.

In summary, the goals of HRE are oriented around the elimination of human rights violations. Through the lens of the legal standards, it is governments (signatories to treaties) that are ultimately responsible for preventing such abuses, both through their own behavior but also through their ability to influence the actions of citizens whose conduct may be negatively affecting the rights of others. Through the lens of social change, the goals of HRE can also be oriented towards the hearts, heads and hands of everyday people. These frames help to explain the diverse ways that HRE has been used in practice, and which I try to capture better in the updated HRE Models. In particular, this analysis suggests that the original HRE Transformation Model would be more accurately described as promoting a goal of social change, incorporating both "activism" including *collective ac-*

tion and community development as well as undertaking individual actions to reduce violations in one's personal life and immediate environment.

HRE Theory of Change & Models

The original HRE Models generally associated program typologies with strategies for social change and human rights activism. The theory of change in these original models was linked with the learning process within formal and nonformal HRE programming. Thus the first “link” in the logic chain leading from HRE to taking action to reduce human rights violations is the individual (learner) and their experience in the HRE program.

In the Values and Awareness Model, there is no specific theory of change in place in relation to social change. The goals of socialization may affirm the existing human rights discourse and provide learners with knowledge of human rights. However, the agency of the learner is not encouraged nor empowerment to take action to reduce human rights violations.

In the Accountability Model, the theory of change was linked with the individual and his or her professional role. A successful HRE experience was intended to influence learners' knowledge, attitude and actions so that they would respect and promote human rights standards in their professional roles. The theory of change here is linked in part with the quality of the HRE learning experience and the disposition of the learner to apply the goals of HRE within the very specific roles and responsibilities they carried out in their work lives. The related theory of change is that learners who successfully absorb the goals of the HRE program and find them relevant for their work life may have changed behaviors that result in the reduction of human rights violations. Law enforcement officials may be less inclined to single out minority group members and they may restrain themselves against use of excessive use of violence. Journalists may be more likely to report on human rights violations and to characterize them as such. Each of these behaviors, to the degree that they are associated with participation in an HRE program, can be seen as part of a logic chain between HRE and improved realization of human rights. In this approach, HRE methodologies

that incorporate critical reflection on one's own work and capacity development in relation to the application of human rights norms to work responsibilities are key.

In the original Transformation Model, the HRE theory of change is quite prominent. In this approach, the HRE methodologies are associated with transformative and emancipatory learning (Bajaj, 2011; Keet, 2010).⁶ HRE methodologies incorporate critical pedagogy and involve a critical reflection on society and conditions that result in injustice. This internal process can be a transformative one for those who have internalized oppression and have a "deficit" resulting from experiences of human rights violations. Thus transformative learning and emancipatory learning – related to critical pedagogy – can bring about profound change in the individual learner. The theory of change is HRE leading to personal transformation, resulting in taking action to eliminate human rights violations.

The result is not only the cultivation of agency but specifically its application to reforming relationships and structures so that they are more equal, non-discriminating, participatory and consistent with human rights norms. As mentioned earlier, such changes might take place in the private domain (among family and friends) as well as in the public domain (in one's community and also including human rights activism).⁷ Thus within the Transformation Model, I locate a theory of change that is explicitly oriented towards both personal and social change.

HRE Teaching and Learning Practices

The original HRE Models did not address pedagogy or teaching methodologies in any depth, with the exception of the mention of transformative learning in relation to the Transformation Model. I propose a categorization of four kinds of methodologies used to deliver HRE. These

⁶ Bajaj has identified a similar approach as "HRE for Transformative Action" and Keet has referred to "resistance" and "empowerment" approaches to HRE.

⁷ Impact assessments the author has carried out for nonformal HRE has shown that learners have taken steps to reduce human rights violations in many parts of their lives, including relationships with family members, with friends and authority figures at school. (See Tibbitts 2010, 2012.)

methodologies intersect with other aspects of the HRE typologies, in particular the Goals for HRE and the learning environment/sponsoring institution. These methodologies are not mutually exclusive, as will be explained, but they do tend to be associated with specific HRE models.

Didactic methodologies. This teaching and learning process is one oriented towards the delivery of content to learners. It can intersect with schools and other environments influenced by a ‘traditional’ culture of education in which there is distance between the educator and the learners, where memorization and rote learning is routine, and where learners are not given opportunities to influence their own learning, for example, through open discussion. Critical reflection, even in relation to the learning process, is not encouraged. An example is introducing the UDHR and asking learners to memorize its content, without any preceding or ensuing activities that involve critique or application to social realities. The teaching of human rights standards in a didactic, hegemonic manner has been associated with the critiques of the human rights system itself being hegemonic and neo-colonial (Baxi, 2007).

Such methodologies reflect the “banking” approach and are associated with the Values and Awareness Approach. Due to the lack of participation and critical reflection, this approach can be seen as one of (attempted) socialization. Given the definition of HRE being “about” “for” and “through” human rights, the focus on content and the application of didactic teaching methods reflects an incomplete, and potentially counterproductive, approach to HRE that is only “about” human rights.⁸

Participatory/interactive methodologies are now almost invariably used in HRE. These are seen as a means of motivating and engaging learners in the learning process. Such methodologies are applied instrumentally with the purpose of learners better understanding human rights content and applying these values to issues at hand. An example is the popular “New Planet” exercise that introduces learners to the UDHR through an activity in which small groups have to develop a ‘rights-based constitu-

⁸ Many textbook reforms limit themselves to the “about.” Training programs that facilitate educators applying participatory methods can help to overcome a purely didactic approach to HRE.

tion' for a fictitious new planet and then compare their constitution with the content of the UDHR.

Participatory methodologies used for HRE result in engagement in the actual teaching and learning practices but are not actually intended to foster agency in the learner. Critical reflection on human rights values and standards and social problems may be addressed, but more as an analytical exercise, perhaps one aimed towards values clarification. Participatory learning takes place as part of the methodological recipe for both the Accountability and Transformative Models.

Empowerment methodologies are oriented towards the cultivation of agency in learners, through specific capacities such as leadership development and the integration of practices of non-discrimination in one's work roles. These various roads to empowerment are in relation to topics and issues of personal interest to the learner. What distinguishes empowerment methodologies from solely participatory ones is that empowerment methodologies explicitly see the learning process as instrumental for individuals having increased capacities to influence their environment.

The literature on HRE has gravitated towards empowerment as a key feature of successful programming and is associated most closely with the Accountability Model and the Transformative Model. At the same time, empowerment is a multifaceted and nuanced concept that is difficult to define in concrete and observable terms. Empowerment methodologies can be easily linked with the skill development required in the Accountability Model. Having the opportunity to develop concrete skills, such as developing organizational or leadership skills, can also be considered a form of "instrumental empowerment" (Ross, Shah, Wang, 2011).

Knowledge itself can be a form of empowerment, for example, learning about the law and how to use it to protect one's rights. Reflecting and recognizing that one's personal values are consistent with those contained in international human rights standards or that one's personal experiences of discrimination are shared by others, can also be empowering.

Transformative methodologies encompass and extend methodologies of instrumental empowerment. Both sets of methodologies are intended to cultivate agency in the learner. However transformative meth-

odologies are different in two respects. The first is that the agency of the learner is cultivated with the explicit aim of social transformation through human rights activism. HRE that prepares learners to organize human rights awareness-raising or campaigning can be associated with transformative methodologies, though this can still be considered a form of instrumental empowerment.

The second way in which transformative methodologies are different than empowerment methodologies is that they can also explicitly foster personal transformation, aligned with the concept of “intrinsic empowerment” (Ross et al., 2011). Transformative and emancipatory learning approaches, drawing from critical pedagogy, invite a critical reflection on power and oppression in one’s local environment, usually as part of a close community of learners. Any subsequent reshaping of one’s understanding of the world can result in taking actions to combat one’s own oppression in one’s family and immediate environment, consistent with wider processes of (privately experienced) social change in a society. When organized on a widespread basis with and for persons belonging to oppressed groups, such personal transformations are the basis of human rights activism.

The specific methodologies of transformative and emancipatory learning are associated with critical pedagogy and Paulo Freire (1968, 1973). The HRE literature is strongly associated with critical pedagogy, which encourages learners to think critically on their situation, recognize connections between their individual problems and the social contexts in which they live and to take action against oppression. Critical pedagogy was and continues to be associated with the HRE Transformation Model, as this model is explicitly oriented towards a form of empowerment related to overcoming internalized oppression.

Summary

In this section, on the basis of scholarship, documented practices and my own experiences and field observations since 2002, I further defined and explored several conceptual categories relevant to HRE Models. These categories will be used in the next section to systematically suggest

modifications to the original HRE Models that refine the models' underlying concepts and expand their descriptions and utility as analytic tools.

In terms of the Goals of HRE and the reduction of human rights violations, I distinguished between the goals of changed behavior of *state actors* (the aim of human rights activism, in relation to human rights (legal) standards) and the goal of changed behavior of *individuals* (an aim of social change, and influenced by the norms of human rights, including general values and standards). The HRE Models collectively address HRE carried out for both human rights activism and social change (with human rights activism as a specific strategy related to broader social change). In making this distinction, it is possible for HRE to be analyzed in relation to its direct role in supporting activism as well as its role in supporting the behavior of individuals in the private domain.

In terms of the HRE Theory of Change, I first acknowledged that we are working with the individual learner, though this learner may be part of a community engaging in HRE. The theory of change for learners within the Accountability and Transformation Model is oriented towards professional development and changes in the personal and public domains that result in the reduction of human rights violations. We see that there is no direct link between the original Values and Awareness Model and social change, as taking action is not explicitly encouraged.

In terms of HRE Teaching and Learning Practices I proposed four clusters of methodologies. The first is the didactic methodologies, which I argue are antithetical to the substance and goals of human rights education if they are the only methodology used. The Values and Awareness Model is the only model to rely on didactic methodologies.⁹The remaining three methodologies are distinct, though linked – moving from participatory (oriented towards the learning process), to empowerment (oriented towards general capacities), to transformative methodologies (orienting action towards social transformation).

⁹ Although the Values and Awareness Model was linked with the schooling sector in the Emerging Models article, this approach is not restricted to the schooling sector and can be found in trainings of a range of groups.

II. Revised Models of HRE

Models represent an idealized framework for understanding human rights education practice. The original HRE Models were developed on the basis of grounded theory to distinguish between the primary practices at that time – efforts within the formal curriculum of schools, adult professional development, and nonformal HRE carried out by non-governmental organizations (NGOs). The Emerging Models recognized target audiences, common approaches and topics, key program features and the plausible link between each model and social change strategies.

In the first half of the article, I identified new dimensions of the HRE models that add descriptive complexity and strengthen their analytical power. In this part of the article, I briefly revisit the original HRE models, critically applying these new dimensions, and then focus on the revised Transformation Model.

Overview of Revised Features of HRE Models

Table 1 presents key features of the revised Models. For each of the models, I overview their key features, drawing on the first part of this article. New components of the HRE models include:

- the nature of the sponsoring organizations
- whether learner participation is voluntary or involuntary
- integration of critical stance
- application of human rights norms
- learner outcomes in relation to agency and transformation
- teaching and learning strategies

MODEL FEATURES	Values and Awareness – Socialization	Accountability – Professional Development	Activism-Transformation
Sponsors	Typically government agencies or authorities	Both government agencies & civil society orgs, sometimes in partnership	Typically sponsored by civil society organizations
Kind of learner participation	Usually involuntary	Both voluntary and involuntary	Usually voluntary
Education sector	Usually in the formal education sector	Both formal (pre-service) and non- formal (in-service) sectors	Usually in the non-formal education sector, including youth and community development
Common target audiences	Students, sometimes the general public	Law enforcement officials, lawyers & judges, civil servants, health & social workers, educators, journalists, religious leaders	Marginalized populations, youth
Incorporation of critical stance	Non-critical stance	Critical view of one's professional role in relation to prevention of HR violations	Critical stance towards one's society or local environment, the nature of power, the human rights system itself
Orientation	Transmission of information	Development of capacities related to work roles and responsibilities	Personal transformation, human rights activism, social change
Key content	General human rights theory, history and content, with some attention to learner's rights	HR content relevant for group, with links to national protection systems and professional codes of conduct	HR content relevant for learner, with strong focus on learner's rights and contemporary, local human rights violations
Treatment of human rights norms & standards	General treatment, with reference of norms to promote positive social behavior	Selected as relevant for professional group; may include appeal to personal value systems	Selected as relevant for the learners, with strong appeal to personal value systems
Teaching and learning strategies	Didactic to participatory	Participatory to instrumentally empowering	Instrumentally to intrinsically empowering/transformational
Strategy for reducing human rights violations	Passive: socialization and legitimization of human rights discourse	Active – agency: application of human rights values & standards within one's professional role	Active – transformational: integration within one's analytical framework, taking action to reduce violations in both private and public domains, participation in collective action and creation of social change agents

Table 1. Key Features of Revised Human Rights Education Models

Key changes in the *Values and Awareness Model* include a re-emphasis of its link with socialization processes, now incorporated within the model title. The description of the Values and Awareness-Socialization Model now recognizes that its methodologies (didactic and participatory) are oriented towards the transmission of content and the validation of certain norms. Typically, this form of HRE is happening in schools as well as in public awareness raising activities. HRE practices in this model do not encourage a critical stance towards one's own values, society or the human rights framework itself. This HRE approach can still incorporate raising learners' awareness of their rights as well as the obligations of duty bearers vis-à-vis international human rights standards.

The title of the *Accountability Model* has been expanded to reflect its use with HRE for individuals in their professional roles. The Accountability-Professional Development Model encourages learners to critically reflect upon human rights values and legal standards as they pertain to their workplace roles and responsibilities. Most likely this will involve some reflection on one's personal values. The methods used range from didactic to instrumentally empowering – meaning that this HRE should result in learners being aware of and more capable of applying human rights.

HRE programming falling under the *Transformation Model* is explicitly aimed at bringing about human rights activism and social change. I have added “activism” to the title of this model to reflect this goal. Because the Activism-Transformation Model is closest to the aspirational model of HRE as emancipatory learning, I will now address this model in greater detail.

Activism-Transformation Model

Table 1 presents a range of descriptive features of each of the revised HRE Models, including Activism-Transformation. For this HRE approach:

- It is typically sponsored by civil society organizations (including human rights and development NGOs, community-service agencies or organizations and faith-based groups).
- Learner participation is usually voluntary.

- HRE is generally carried out in the nonformal education sector, including through trainings, popular education, youth and community development.
- Common target audiences are marginalized populations and youth.
- HRE incorporates a critical stance towards features of one's own society or local environment, the nature of power/authority, and the human rights system itself.
- HRE is oriented towards transformation: increased self-confidence, capacity-development for taking action, and participation in human rights activism/ long-term social change.
- Content will depend upon the audience and local context, but may include some content background on human rights, a focus on the learner's own rights, contemporary human rights violations and the work of groups combating such abuses.
- Human rights norms and standards applied are relevant for the learners with strong appeals to personal value systems so that human rights norms are internalized and solidarity is promoted.
- Teaching and learning strategies range from instrumentally empowering to intrinsically empowering/transformational
- The strategies for reducing human rights violations (active – transformation) include integration of human rights values and standards within one's analytical framework; taking action to reduce human rights violations within one's private and public domains; and participation in collective action and the creation of social change agents.

Programming within the Activism-Transformation Model is usually non-formal and voluntary. It is often carried out by a range of civil society organizations oriented towards marginalized groups, youth, community development and the training of human rights workers.¹⁰

Within this approach, HRE concentrates on the internationalization of human rights values and critical perspectives. Thus in applying the human rights lens meaningfully in their own lives, learners may demonstrate

¹⁰ Teachers in schools who sponsor human rights or children's rights clubs normally do so in affiliation with such a group and their efforts would thus fall under this model.

new behavior in their personal domain (addressing unequal relations in the family) as well as in the public domain (for example, participating in campaigns or affiliating with a human rights NGO). The strategy for reducing human rights violations is thus immediate and personal as well as long-term, public and collective.

Teaching and learning processes will involve methodologies of participation, empowerment but also transformation by incorporating critical pedagogy within the HRE program goals. These kinds of HRE programming incorporate a critical stance towards features of one's own society, the nature of power/authority, and even the human rights system itself.

In promoting social change, the Transformation-Activist Model incorporates both "activism" including *collective action* and *community development* as well as undertaking *individual actions to reduce violations in one's personal life* and immediate environment.

Thus different kinds of HRE programs fall under the Activism-Transformation model. There are those that are solely focused on activism, such as the training of human rights workers. This link is a self-evident one and represents a form of instrumental empowerment.

Another type of HRE program falling within the category of Activism-Transformation is aimed specifically towards marginalized and excluded groups, such as certain groups of women, migrants and refugees, those that have experienced systematic discrimination, persons with disabilities and the extreme poor. Learners coming from groups identified as marginalized may have personally experienced human rights violations and internalized oppression. An immediate aim of HRE is healing, intrinsic empowerment and personal transformation as demonstrated through increased self-confidence and capacity for taking action to reduce human rights violations that are being personally experienced. These learners with enhanced critical consciousness may take action in their personal sphere and also engage in human rights activism and long-term social change efforts. The strategy for reducing human rights violations is thus immediate and personal as well as long-term, public and collective. Examples of empirical studies that explored the results of HRE programming specifically designed for groups experiencing systematic denial of their human rights

and falling within the Activist-Transformation Model include Bajaj's 2012 study of the Institute of Human Rights Education's efforts with educators teaching children in India, and Tibbitts' study of the Turkey Women for Women's Human Rights - New Ways non-formal HRE programming for women (2012, 2015).

The Activism-Transformation Model also applies to HRE that is carried out as part of youth development and community development, of which HRE may be one component of a wider strategy of leadership and capacity development. These programs share a common goal to encourage learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. Some programs have used the critical HRE framework to review local conditions and to self-organize for change, such as the case of Tostan in West Africa that has encouraged women to organize effectively around abandoning the practice of female genital cutting (Gillespie & Melching, 2010). There are examples of Human Rights Cities (Marks & Modrowski, 2008) where community members come together to review their community through a human rights lens, identifying ways in which human rights violations can be reduced and then organizing solutions.

Human rights clubs in schools can serve this purpose by fostering an analysis of human rights issues, encouraging youth to take leadership in organizing awareness raising and mobilization actions. Amnesty International clubs and Human Rights-Friendly Schools have encouraged student empowerment and activism.

Non-formal HRE is almost invariably carried out by civil society organizations. Such organizations are explicitly oriented towards the critical framework of human rights. This, combined with the voluntary nature of participation, create ideal circumstances for fostering activism, in particular, activism driven by the goals and interests of the learners.

The self-selection of persons into HRE opportunities suggests a pre-existing alignment of personal values with the human rights message. Students who decide to participate in Amnesty International school groups or women who participate in women's human rights training programs are likely to be predisposed to benefit from and act upon the experiences they gain. The voluntary nature of their involvement suggests the potential for

the internalization of human rights norms and their application in ways that are personally meaningful.

Concluding Thoughts

In the second part of this article, I revisited the original HRE models. I argued that the original HRE models remain useful typologies for describing HRE practices and for critically analyzing their design in promoting agency in learners to take action to reduce human rights violations. I proposed amendments to the models including: a stronger association of the Values and Awareness Model with socialization, the Accountability Model with professional development, and the Transformation Model with activism.

The Activism-Transformation Model now includes any kind of HRE programming that cultivates activism (regardless of whether the learner is a member of a marginalized group). Within the Accountability-Professional Development Model, sub-groups of adult learners are broken out, with implications for HRE program goals, content and approaches. The Values and Awareness-Socialization model—if implemented in isolation and not as a first step towards more comprehensive HRE—continues to be a problematic one within HRE practices, as it is not designed to cultivate either learner agency or social transformation.

A considerable amount of HRE scholarship and programming remains focused on the formal schooling sector despite the challenges for carrying out critical HRE. In the years to come, I hope that ongoing reflexive praxis will result in the reorienting of HRE programming currently falling within the Values and Awareness-Socialization category. We should see a general movement of HRE methodologically away from didactic approaches towards those that foster empowerment and transformation.

Through revisiting and revising the 2002 HRE Models I have tried to offer a more complex and accurate description of the programming falling within each of them. These revised models should provide a clearer analytical framework for reviewing and designing HRE in keeping with its central mission to contribute to the reduction of human rights violations.

A revisiting of the models in light of evolving HRE theory also points to the importance of integrating a reflective and critical stance – towards one’s own value system, power structures in one’s immediate and more distant environments, as well as towards the human rights framework itself (as its presentation of values and legal standards cannot be presented without creating a genuine dialogue and engagement with learners’ existing and therefore valid world views). We thus return to the paradox of HRE mentioned at the outset of this article. In its ideal form, HRE must somehow present international human rights norms and standards in order to foster a sense of common humanity, shared values and a “common cause” in global human rights and social movements while at the same time recognizing that the particularities of culture and the necessity for individuals to express and pursue their own articulated needs and change agendas.

Because of the international standards associated with HRE, I am convinced that this field will have staying power. However, these origins, the claims of universality and the hierarchical nature of the government institutions sponsoring HRE means that there will be an inevitable and ongoing struggle to keep HRE close to critical pedagogy, its original mother. I am optimistic about this enterprise if we human rights educators continue to reflect upon, critique, and improve our efforts.

References

- Bajaj, M. (2011). Human rights education: Ideology, location, and approaches. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 33, 481-508.
- Bajaj, M. (2012). *Schooling for social change: The rise and impact of Human rights education in India*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- Baxi, U. (2007). *Human rights in a posthuman world*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Freire, P. (1968). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Freire, P. (1973). *Education for critical consciousness*. New York: Seabury Press.
- Gillespie, D. & Melching, M. (2010). The transformative power of democracy and human rights in nonformal education: The case of Tostan. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 60(5), 477-498.
- Keet, A. (2012). Discourse, betrayal, critique: The renewal of human rights education. In C. Roux (Ed.), *Safe spaces: Human rights education in diverse contexts* (pp. 7-27). Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.
- Keet, A. (2010). A Conceptual typology of human rights education and associated pedagogical forms. *Journal of Human Rights Education*, 2(1), 30-41.
- Marks, S.P. & Modrowski, K.A. (with W. Lichem). (2008). *Human rights cities: Civic engagement for societal development*. Nairobi: UN Habitat.
- Müller, L. (2009). *Human rights education in German schools and post-*

secondary institutions. Research in human rights education, Series, No. 2. Amsterdam/Cambridge: Human Rights Education Associates.

- Myre, G. (2017). "10 Guantanamo Prisoners Freed in Oman: 45 Detainees Remain". National Public Radio. January 17. Accessed June 27, 2017. <http://www.npr.org/sections/thetwo-way/2017/01/16/510089954/10-guantanamo-prisoners-freed-in-oman-45-detainees-remain>
- Ross, H.A., Shah, P.P. & Wang, L. (2011). Situating empowerment for Millennial Schoolgirls in Gujarat, India and Shaanxi, China. *Feminist Formations*, 23(3), 23-47.
- Teleki, K. (2007). *Human rights training for adults: What twenty-six evaluation studies say about design, implementation and follow-up*. Research in Human Rights Education, Series, No. 1. Amsterdam/Cambridge: Human Rights Education Associates.
- Tibbitts, F. (2002). Understanding what we do: Emerging models for human rights education. *International Review of Education*, 48(3-4), 531-549.
- Tibbitts, F. with Foong, D., Kasprzak, T., Keet, A. & Melouk, M. (2010). *Impact Assessment of Rights-Education-Action Program (REAP)*. Prepared for Amnesty International-Norway and Amnesty International.
- Tibbitts, F. with Batik, E. (2012). *Impact assessment of the Human Rights Education Program for Women (HREP)*. Prepared for Women for Women's Human Rights – New Ways, Istanbul.
- Tibbitts, F. (2015). Women's human rights education in Turkey: Feminist pedagogy and trainer's engagement in social change. *Journal of Peace Education*, 13(1), 41-59.
- United Nations, General Assembly. (2011). *United Nations Declaration on*

Human Rights Education and Training. GA 66/127, Art. 2, paras. 1-2.
Geneva: United Nations.